DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 331 CG 006 202

AUTHOR	Radin, Norma
TITLE	Evaluation of the Daycare Consultation Program 1969-1970.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. School of Social Work.
PUB DATE	28 Sep 70
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes, Behavior Change, *Consultation Programs, *Day Care Services, Inservice Programs, *Lower Class, *Middle Class, *Preschool Children, Social Class

ABSTRACT

Evaluated is a program with two components: individual consultations offered bi-weekly to daycare mothers in their homes, and group discussions in which the mothers talked about their mutual concerns and interests. Hypotheses tested were: (1) participants would show a greater increase in attitudes and behaviors conducive to growth of children than their matched controls, as well as a greater increase in their sense of fate control; and (2) preschool experimental children would show greater behavior change than the control youngsters. The sample consisted of one middle and one lower class experimental group, and one middle and one lower class control group. There were five mothers in each group. Findings show that experimental group mothers, regardless of class, differed significantly from their matched controls in showing an increase in rejection of the homemaker role by the end of the year, and that mothers in the lower class experimental group evaluated their daycare children as being more dependent at the end of the year than at the beginning. Increased dependence upon significant adults is considered desirable in lower class children since it suggests an increased susceptibility to influence by future teachers. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document. (Author/RSM)

ED0 47331

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
School of Social Work

EVALUATION OF
THE DAYCARE
CONSULTATION PROGRAM OF 1969-70

CG 006 202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Norma Radin

September 28. 1970

The University of Michigan Daycare Consultation program was established to determine whether it was feasible and beneficial to offer consultation services to licensed daycare mothers. The question is of significance today because the need for child care facilities is certain to grow in the coming decade, particularly among low income families, and the ability of daycare centers to serve all youngsters is limited. There are cost problems, logisitic problems, health problems, and personality problems which necessitate the existence of an alternate model of child care. The paradigm of a woman caring for a few youngsters within her own home is a logical alternative to a large center caring for 20 to 80 youngsters. One problem with this alternative, however, is that the care offered within private homes is highly variable. Although all women who apply must meet minimum standards to be licensed as daycare mothers, there is a wide range in knowledge and skill about childrearing practices which foster social, emotional, and cognitive development. Thus the need for pre-service and in-service training is great. This is particularly true in low-income areas where the youngsters' chances of succeeding in school are low due partially to their experiences in the first few years of life.. For this reason emphasis has been placed in recent years on parent education as a component of compensatory educational programs but surrogate parents have generally been neglected. Two exceptions to this pattern are programs in New York City, and Pawtucket, R.I. where training in childcare is offered to welfare recipients who become licensed caretakers. In an effort to test a relatively unique model of consultation, one based upon parent programs developed in several local compensatory pre-school projects, (The Perry Preschool Project, The Early Education Program, the Supplementary Kindergarten Program, etc.) the School of Education and the School of Social Work of the University of Michigan established The Daycare Consultation Program on a pilot basis in the 1969-70 school year.

The program had two components: individual consultations, offered bi-weekly, to daycare mothers in their own homes; and group discussions. The latter involved a series of meetings in which the licensed mothers came together to talk about their mutual concerns and interests. In both the one-to-one situation, and the small group setting, staff members of the Consultation Program were present to offer help and guidance in maximizing the development of the participant children. The major objectives of the program were: 1) To increase the skills and knowledge of the daycare parent in

fostering the development of preschool aged children: and 2) to increase the caretaker's perception of herself as a competent adult and a professional child caretaker. The hypotheses tested, which were related to the goals, were: 1) That the participants in the program would show a greater increase in attitudes and behaviors conducive to the growth of the child, than their matched controls who were willing to participate but not included in the program; 2) That the participants in the program would show a greater increase in their sense of efficacy or fate control than their matched controls who were not participants in the program; and 3) That the preschool children being cared for by participants in the programs would show greater behavior change associated with social, emotional, and intellectual growth than the preschool children cared for by control caretakers.

Procedure

The project staff consisted of an educational consultant, her aide, a program supervisor (the director of the project), a research associate, and 3 students, one from the School of Edcuation and two from the School of Social Work. Home visits were made approximately every two weeks to each daycare mother during the year by the consultant or the aide. The group program, which started in February, involved a total of six meetings approximately two weeks apart and were conducted by the social work students. A description of the home visits and group meetings would be beyond the scope of this paper. Detailed information about both components appears in a paper entitled "The Educational Day Care Consultation Program." (Sonquist, 1970)

To test the first hypothesis related to childrearing practices and attitudes, two instruments were used: 1) The Glasser-Radin Revision of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (the PARI) (Radin and Glasser 1965 and 1970) which taps four dimensions pertaining to childrearing: Authoritarianism, Strictness, Equalitarianism, and Rejection of the Homemaker Role; and 2) An open-ended child management questionaire, developed by the staff asking the daycare mothers how they would react in a variety of situations which required child management strategies. Three dimensions were measured in each of ten questions: use of reinforcment, use of consultation with the child, and sensitivity to the child's needs.

To test the second hypothesis concerning a sense of fate control and professionalism in the caretaker, the Gurin Revision of Rotter's Scale of Externality and Internality (The Social Reaction Inventory) was used (Gurin et al., 1969). One of the P.A.R.I. factors, "Rejection of the Homemaker Role", was also employed to test this hypothesis.

To test the third hypothesis related to child behaviors, a Revision of the Pupil Behavior Inventory (the P.B.I.) originally developed by Vinter, et.al. (1966) was employed. This is a rating scale in which the respondent, usually a teacher, but here a surrogate parent, is asked to evaluate youngsters on a five point scale given a list of typical child behaviors. Eight dimensions are tapped by this instrument: classroom conduct, creative inquisitiveness, good student behavior, dependence on teacher, physical condition, academic motivation, social behavior, and socio-emotional adjustment.

The daycare mothers participating in the program were also asked to evaluate the program anonymously at the conclusion of the year. The questionnaire used, as well as the four instruments referred to above appear at the end of this report.

The sample consisted of four groups with five mothers in each group: a middle class experimental group, a middle class control group, lower-class experimental group, and a lower class control group. This design was used to prevent generalizing findings based on one social class to another without supportive data. All of the names, except those in the middle class experimental group, were obtained through the cooperation of the Washtenaw County Department of Social Services. The members of the experimental

middle class group were semi-organized before the program started, and were seeking the services of an itinerant teacher. (Their efforts were instrumental in inaugurating the pilot program.) In spite of great effort by the staff, three lower class experimental mothers dropped out of the program after the first few months for a variety of reasons and had to be replaced. In some cases they were replaced by mothers in the lower class control group who were then replaced by new matched controls. In other cases new lower class experimental caretakers were found. Thus, neither the variable of time spent in the project nor the time between administration of pre and psot measures was controlled. The minimum in both cases, however, was four months. No new participants were added after January 15, 1970. The maximum number of individual home consultations offered was six for the three replacements who joined the program January 15, 1970. The maximum number was 16 for those who were involved in the program from its inception in October 1969 until its termination in May 1970.

Each participant in the program had a preschool-aged child in her care, two to five years of age. In addition, the control and experimental groups for each social class were matched on as many variables as feasible, Table I reflects the characteristics of the sample in October 1969.

All of the lower class mothers were welfare recipients themselves or supervised a child whose care was being paid for by the Department of Social Service, and hence came from a low-income family. Inasmuch as these day care mothers lived in the same neighborhood as their charges, they too were considered low-income women without seeking corroboration. It was felt unwise to make inquiries about their personal financial status.

When changes were made in the lower class groups in mid-year of the

program, an effort was made to maintain matching on all variables but this was not possible. As of January 15, 1970, there were 5 mothers in the lower class experimental group, 4 in the lower class control group, and four mothers in each middle class group. (Two middle class women stopped providing daycare services and were dropped from the program. The pressure of time prevented finding replacements for them.) Table II reflects the characteristics of the 4 groups on January 15. Complicating the research design was the fact that only respondents who completed both pre and post questionnaires were included in the analysis. There were some mothers from both lower class and middle class samples who could not be reached for the post tests; they had either moved, refused to answer, or were no longer caring for children. Thus in spite of efforts to maintain a relatively pure and complete sample of four groups for whom full data were to be available, this was impossible. One variable that was controlled to some extent was the attention factor. The members of the control groups received three mailings during the year containing material related to childcare.

Results

Table 3 summarizes the number of home visits which were completed, cancelled, and abandoned when the daycare mother was not home. It can be seen that over 4/5 of the planned visits were completed in both middle class and lower class groups. Although a higher percent of visits were completed for the former group, the difference was not great. The most notable difference between classes was in manner of handling appointments which could not be kept. The middle class mothers tended to cancel the appointment, the lower class mothers simply were not there. This difference may have been due to the fact that some of the low-income mothers did not

have telephones.

Table 4 pertains to attendance at group meetings. The percent of meetings attended by the lower-class mothers (67%) was unusually high for this type of population where a more usual figure is 33% (Wittes and Radin, 1969).). Even more surprising is the finding that attendance by the lower class mothers surpassed that of their middle-class peers. The mean number of meetings attended by the lower class women was 4.0 out of a possible 6. For the middle class women the figure was 3.0.

Table 5 contains the results obtained from the revised PARI. It can be seen that the only factor showing a significant difference between groups was that of Rejection of the Homemaker Role. There was a significant difference in between the total experimental and total control group, with the experimental group showing a significantly greater increase in rejection of the role of homemaker. Since both classes displayed a tendency for experimental mothers to increase their rejection of the role, the significant difference found when middle class and lower class groups were combined cannot be attributed to one group alone.

Table 6 summarize the results obtained when the revised Pupil Behavior Inventory was used. The scores represent the responses of the lower class mothers. Since no middle class control mothers completed this questionnaire at the end of the program, and only one middle class experimental mother did so, no middle class PBI's were used. Four lower class experimental mothers completed pre and post measures for a total of 7 children and two lower class control mothers completed pre and post PBI's for 5 children. The sample is particularly small for this instrument because there tends to be a turnover of children and information was included in the analysis only when a pre and post form was completed for the same child. It can be

seen that only one factor showed a significant difference between experimental and control group, that of Teacher Dependence. The lower class experimental group showed a significantly greater increase in this dimension than the lower class control.

For the other two instruments used, the Social Reaction Inventory and the Child Management Questionnaire, no significant differences were found between control and experimental groups for either lower class, middle class, or lower and middle class combined.

Table 7 contains the responses obtained from the evaluation questionnaire completed by the participants, anonymously, at the end of the year. Their positive feelings about the program are quite evident. Among the comments offered in response to the question "What did you especially like about the visits?" were:

"I learn a lot from visits." "The help given in how to deal with specific children and their problems." "Talking about different things to do with the children benefits them." "The different things about how to deal with the children." "Demonstrations to see helper's technique."

One person when asked "What didn't you like about the visits?" felt the visit was too short. Another felt the children "monopolized" the consultant "Yet the consultant's demonstrations with the children were particularly helpful, as well as her observations regarding their interactions." Another mother felt the visits of once each week tried in the beginning were too frequent. Once every three weeks was enough.

Some of the comments made in response to the question "What did you especially like about the meetings?" were:

the

"I learn lot from the meeting." "Talking about problems other Daycare mothers had. The last meeting was just great." "Getting to know the people involved." "The freeness to speak." "Getting acquainted with the group." "Exchanging ideas - different children's projects."

Among the responses to the question "What didn't you like about the meeting were: "Lack of tactfulness of some members-but that's women." The meeting too too long." "Not enough new material was presented." "So many complaints seem unnecessary." "Rather have the teacher teaching." "I would like to see meetings . . . (as) a type of class given by teacher."

Some general comments offered were: "On the whole I felt the program was tremely worthwhile. I learned a great deal and it made home daycare more than me babysitting. Thank you all." ". . . I learned much about children, moods, learning abilities, coping with different personalities, etc. . ." "Are we going to have meetings this fall?"

Discussion

The data presented portray a picture not atypical of programs involving educationally-oriented programs for adults. The participants enjoyed the experience greatly but the instruments used do not suggest that much change occurred. Two significant findings which did emerge are provocative. One of these was a rejection of the homemaker role in the experimental group. Since the control group showed a decrease on this PARI factor during the period the program was in operation, the changes appearing in the two groups were significantly different. It appears that the program did have an impact on the participants; it succeeded in arousing their interests in non-home affairs. There were observable indications that this change was taking place. Many of the participants wanted to learn more about

techniques of stimulating children. Some also expressed a desire to organize themselves and improve their status as daycare mothers. There were complaints about their working conditions such as delays in receiving checks, and a scarcity of referrals from the Department of Social Service, to name a few. The daycare mothers appeared to see themselves as relatively helpless vis-a-vis the welfare agencies at the local, state and national levels. Learning that other daycare mothers had the same concerns enabled them to begin to express their views as a group to relevant authority figures. The fa that their sense of fate control as measured by the Social Reaction Inventory, did not go up is not surprising. The daycare mothers made some efforts to effect change in their status during the program and were unsuccessful. A study by Zurcher (in press) and Dr. Patricia Guren of the University of Michigan* yielded similar results. It was found that making people aware that they had potential power while they were unable to effect change in their lives resulted in no increase in their sense of competence. Perhaps it is unrealistic to anticipate such a change in the participants of a project such as this, particularly over a short period of time. A more fruitful assessment of the program may involve an investigation of the participants' desire and efforts to learn more about childcare to improve the quality of their work as professional caretakers. Although this factor was not explored directly, the positive responses of the women to questions about their interest in continuing in the program next year indicate that accompanying the rejection of the homemaker role may have been a desire to learn more about their field. These findings suggest that it is

---

*Personal communication, October 5, 1970.

incumbent upon those who conduct daycare consultation programs to continue the program beyond one year or arrange for some other type of educational follow-up service.

The second significant finding was that there was an increase in dependence among the children being cared for by the lower-class day-care mothers as rated by these women. Although this may appear to be a detrimental change, it is considered a desirable modification among young lower class children. (It is assumed that the children cared for by the daycare mothers who were AFDC recipients were themselves low-income children because of the proximity of their homes.) In one compensatory preschool program in Ypsilant, Michigan (Radin and Sonquist, 1968) it was found that Teacher Dependency at the beginning of the year as measured by the Pupil Behavior Inventory was positively correlated with an increase in IQ during the school year. Thus the children who showed the most dependence upon the teacher were the children who profited most from the program. According to Radin and Sonquist:

"The relationship found between IQ gain and dependency is congruent with the views of Walters and Parke (1964) who define dependence as 'susceptibility to social influence'... From this one can infer that children who enter preschool with dependency habits are more open to influence, and hence to cognitive stimulation by a teaching staff....."(p. 17)

Similarly, Vinter et. al. (1966) in their study of the impact of a group work program upon malperforming students in secondary schools found those who participated in the program showed an increase in Teacher Dependency as measured by the PBI. It was hypothesized that for children who were typically detached from teacher influence, this was a step in a desirable direction. Teachers can only affect those who are open to their influence. Although it is possible to become overly dependent upon a teacher

or daycare mother, this is an unlikely phenomenon among children with behavior problems in school or low-income preschoolers.

The high attendance at home visits and group meetings gives evidence that a daycare consultation program can be conducted among both lower class and middle class populations. The service offered was not something the caretakers evaded or avoided in spite of their busy schedules. Although there were no hard data to support this view, it was believed by the staff that the early high dropout rate among the lower class mothers was related to the focus of the consultation service. It initially emphasized cognitive stimulation in a fairly structured situation. This approach had been found to be highly effective in preschool programs which involved work with natural mothers in lower class areas. For low-income daycare mothers however, the immediate problems of daily survival appeared more salient than fostering the growth of children who were not their own. During the second half of the program the emphasis was placed upon helping the caretaker manage the children in her home during the day. No further drop-outs occurred and the response to this approach was distinctly positive. The new strategy in no way impeded the introduction of practices which were beneficial to the children

Conclusion.

It appears that it is possible to offer and conduct an in-service consultation program for both lower class and middle class daycare mothers. The caretakers' response was positive to both individual home visits and group meetings. Mothers who participated in the program, regardless of class, differed significantly from their matched controls in showing an increase in rejection of the homemaker role by the end of the year. This finding suggests that their interests were turning outward, probably toward professional caretaking judging by their desire to continue in the program another year. The importance of continuing an educational consultation program or some following service was clear. The mothers in the lower-class experimental group were also found to evaluate their daycare children as more dependent upon them at the end of the year than the beginning. This change did not occur with the lower-class control mothers. Increased dependence upon teacher or surrogate parent is considered a desirable change in

lower class children since it suggests an increased involvement with adults and hence increased susceptibility to influence by future teachers.

In summary, the pilot study indicated that a daycare consultation program is feasible, is desired by caretakers, and has discernible desirable effects upon both caretakers and the children they supervise even in a short time period. The importance of continuing the service beyond one year cannot be overlooked.

NR:lw

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R.C., and Beattie, M. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro Youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 3, 29-53.

Radin, N., and Glasser, P. The use of parental attitude questionnaires with culturally disadvantaged families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, August, 1965, 273, 373-382.

Radin, N., and Glasser P. The utility of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument for Internvention with low-income families. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1970

Sonquist H. The Educational Daycare Consultation Program. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1970

Vinter, R., Sarri, R., Vorwaller, and Schaefer, W., Pupil Inventory: A Manual for Administration and Scoring. Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1965.

Wittes, G., and Radin, N. Two approaches to parent work in a compensatory preschool program. Paper read at the National Conference on Family Relations, Washington, D.C., October 1969.

Zurcher.L. The poverty board: some consequences of maximum feasible participation. Journal of Social Issues, in press 1970.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE
on 10/15/69

	Lower Class Experimental Group	Lower Class Control Group	Middle Class Experimental Group	Middle Class Control Group
Number in Sample	5	5	5	5
% Black	80%	80%	0%	0%
Mean Educ.	9.4yrs.	10.0yrs.	14.4yrs.	11.4yrs.
Residence in Ann Arbor	60%	40%	100%	100%
Mean Age	42	40	27	41
Mean Number of Daycare Children Aged 2-4	2.4	2.2	1.8	2.2
% on Welfare	60%	60%	0%	0%

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

OF SAMPLE ON JANUARY 15, 1970

	Lower Class Experimental Group	Lower Class Control Group	Middle Class Experimental Group	Middle Class Control Group
Number in Sample	5	4	4	4
% Blace	60%	75%	0%	0%
Mean Education	10.4 yrs.	8.5 yrs.	13.2 yrs.	11.4 yrs.
Residence in Ann Arbor	60%	50%	100%	60%
Mean Number of Daycare Children Aged 2-4	2.2	2.2	1.8	2.2
Mean Age	40	41	28	41

TABLE 3

HOME VISITS BY CONSULTANTS a

		Lower Class (N=5)	Middle Class (N=4)
MEAN:	Number Home Visits Completed	8.6	12.7
	Number Home Visits Cancelled by Daycare Mother	.8	2.2
	Number of Home Visits made and Daycare Mother not Present	.6	.2
Percent:	Of Home Visits Attempted Which Were Completed	81%	84%
	Of Home Visits Cancelled by Daycare Mothers	9%	15%
	Of Home Visits Made and Daycare Mothers Not Present	10%	1%
	Total	100%	100%

a) For all the middle class mothers and for two lower class mothers who entered the program in October 1969, there was a maximum of 16 possible home visits. For three lower class mothers entering the program in January 1970, there was a maximum of 6 possible home visits.

TABLE 4

ATTENDANCE AT GROUP MEETINGS a)

	Lower Class (N=5)	Middle Class (N=4)	Total population (N=9)
Mean number of meetings attended	4	3	3.6
Mean percent of meetings attended	67%	50%	59.2%
Mean number attending each meeting	3.3	2.0	5.3

@ There were 6 meetings held between February 7 and April 20, 1970

TABLE 5

Mean: Change Scores on the Glasser-Radin
Revision of the P.A.R.I. (Pre-Post Scores)

Factor	Lower Class Experimental Group (N=4)	Lower Class Control Group (N=3)	Middle Class Experimental Group (N=4)	Middle Class Control Group (N=3)	Total Exper. Group (N=6)	Total Control Group (N=6)
Authoritar-ianism	1.2	1.3	-0.5	4.0	0.3	2.6
Strictness	-1.2	1.3	0.5	0.7	-3.8	1.0
Equalitar-ianism	-0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	-.3	.0
Rejection of Home-maker Role	-2.2	0.3	-2.7	0.7	-2.2*	0.5*

*Significantly different; $p < .05$; one-tail test; Mann-Whitney Test

TABLE 6

Mean Change Scores in the Revised Pupil Behavior Inventory (Pre-Post)

Factor	Lower Class Experimental Group (N=7)[a]	Lower Class Control Group (N=5)[b]
Poor Classroom Conduct	0	.7
Creative Inquisitiveness	0	.2
Good Student Behavior	.1	.1
Teacher Dependence	-.2*	.9*
Poor Physical Condition	0	-.9
Academic Motivation	.3	.2
Anti-Social Behavior	.1	.4
Poor Socio-emotional Adjustment	.3	-.5

*Significantly different; $p < .05$; one-tail test; Mann-Whitney test
a) Seven children were rated; four mothers did the rating.
b) Five children were rated; two mothers did the rating.

TABLE 7

Anonymous Evaluation of Program by Participants (N=8)[a]

Question	Mean Response on 5 Point Scale (5= Very Helpful; 1= Not at all Helpful)	% Finding Program Very Helpful (Rating of 5 Given)	% Answering yes
Did you find the visits to your home helpful?	4.6	88%	-
Did you feel the group meetings were helpful?	4.2	62%	-
Would you be interested in a program like this next year?	-	-	75%[b]

a) As there were 9 participants at the end of the year, this represents a return rate of 89%.

b) Two stated they will not be living in the area next year; the other 6 responded yes.

DATE _____

NAME _____

QUESTIONNAIRE 4

SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Put a circle around the letter in front of the statement of your choice. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

REMEMBER

Select that alternative which you personally believe to be more true.

I more strongly believe that:

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.

   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.

   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.

   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.

   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.

   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.

   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.

   b. People who can't get others to like them, don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.

   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

I more strongly believe that:

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.

    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work, that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.

    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.

    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.

    b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.

    b. Who gets to be boss depends on who has the skill and ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.

    b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people c control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controll by accidental happenings.

    b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

I more strongly believe that:

19. a. One should always be willing to admit his mistakes.

    b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

    b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.

    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.

    b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.

    b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.

    b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

    b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck play an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.

    b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.

    b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.

    b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

I more strongly believe that:

29. a. Knowing the right people is important in deciding whether a person will get ahead.

    b. People will get ahead in life if they have the goods and do a good job, knowing the right people has nothing to do with it.

30. a. Leadership positions tend to go to capable people who deserve being ch

    b. It's hard to know why some people get leadership positions and others ability doesn't seem to be the important factor.

31. a. People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just come their way.

    b. Some people just don't use the breaks that come their way. If they d do well, it's their own fault.

INVENTORY OF ATTITUDES ON FAMILY LIFE AND CHILDREN

Parental Attitude Research Instrument
(Glasser-Radin Revision)

Read each of the statements below and circle the appropriate letter: "A" for "strongly agree", "a" for "mildly agree", "d" for "mildly disagree", and "D" for "strongly disagree".

A	a	d	D
strongly agree	mildly agree	mildly disagree	strongly disagree

There is no right or wrong answer, so encourage mother to answer according to her own opinion. It is very important to the study that all questions be answered. Many of the statements will seem alike, but all are necessary to show slight diff

	Agree		Disagree	
A child who is "on the go" all the time will most likely to be happy.	A	a	d	D
Children should be more considerate of their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.	A	a	d	D
Children will get on any woman's nerves if she has to be with them all day.	A	a	d	D
Sex is one of the greatest problems to be contended with in all children.	A	a	d	D
Some children are just so bad they must be taught to fear adults for their own good.	A	a	d	D
Children pester you with all their little upsets if you aren't careful from the first.	A	a	d	D
Children would be happier and better behaved if parents would show an interest in their affairs.	A	a	d	D
Children should never learn things outside the home which make them doubt their parents' ideas.	A	a	d	D
Mothers very often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.	A	a	d	D
Children are actually happier under strict training.	A	a	d	D
The sooner a child learns to walk the better he's trained.	A	a	d	D

	Agree		Disagr
Parents must earn the respect of their children by the way they act.	A	a	d
A child will be grateful later on for strict training.	A	a	d
A mother should do her best to avoid any disappointment for her child.	A	a	d
There is usually something wrong with a child who asks a lot of questions about sex.	A	a	d
Parents should know better than to allow their children to be exposed to difficult situations.	A	a	d
Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.	A	a	d
A good mother will find enough social life within the family.	A	a	d
One of the worst things about taking care of a home is a woman feels that she can't get out.	A	a	d
Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children.	A	a	d
A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.	A	a	d
The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is they suually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.	A	a	d
There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child.	A	a	d
Most children are toilet trained by 15 months of age.	A	a	d
Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates, and fun help them grow up right.	A	a	d
Most children should have more discipline.	A	a	d
A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is part of her.	A	a	d
Having to be with the children all the time gives a woman the feeling that her wings have been clipped.	A	a	d
When you do things together, children feel close to you and can talk easier.	A	a	d
Few men realize that a mother needs some fun in life too.	A	a	d

	Agree		Disagre
The child should not question the thinking of his parents.	A	a	d
Strict discipline develops a fine character.	A	a	d
A child soons learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.	A	a	d
When a child is in trouble he ought to know he won't be punished for talking about it with his parents.	A	a	d
A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.	A	a	d
A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking.	A	a	d
A child can probably get a good job if he's willing to work hard even though he does not graduate from high school.	A	a	d
Most mothers feel very comfortable when they go up to school.	A	a	d
A busy mother does not have time to read to her children.	A	a	d
The principal is an easy man to talk to.	A	a	d
A busy mother doesn't have time to find out what her children are learning in school.	A	a	d

MOTHER'S RATING FORM

Child's Name_____Mother_____

Please write in for each item the letter(s) of the rating chosen for thic child (see box.) It is not necessary to spend a great deal of time on yo decision. Please answer all items, even if you are not sure or have lit information. If you cannot answer an item, please write in "don't know."

Alternative Ratings

VF - Very Frequently
F - Frequently
S - Sometimes
I - Infrequently
VI - Very Infrequently

1.___Starts things on his own.

2.___Uses materials in a variety of ways.

3.___Blames others for trouble.

5.___Resistant to you.

6.___Seeks your approval.

7.___Alert and interested in activities.

8.___Can stay with one activity for some time.

9.___Attempts to make you do what he wants you to do.

10.___Asks questions.

11.___Appears depressed or sad.

12.___Explores objects in the home.

13.___Remebers what he learns.

14.___Tries to act like you.

15.___Is absent.

16.___Can change the way he acts or does things.

17.___Withdrawn.

18.___Proud of what he makes.

19.___Completes his tasks.

20.___Trusts you.

21.___Influences others toward troublemaking.

22.___Appears hungry.

24.___Starts talking or playing wi you on his own.

25.___Seeks constant reassurance.

26.___Takes time to think in makin decisions.

27.___Is eager to learn.

28.___Brings his treasures from ho

29.___Acts without thinking.

30.___Appears in poor health.

31.___Lying or cheating.

32.___Curious about the things arc him.

34.___Requires continuous supervis

35.___Aggressive toward other chil ren.

36.___Asks information from you.

37.___Disobedient.

38.___Steals.

39.___Friendly, and liked by other children.

40.___Appears concerned about your opinions.

41.___Follows directions.

42.___Can only pay attention for a short time.

43.___Easily led into trouble.

44.___Resentful of criticism or discipline.

45.___Hesitant to try, or gives up easily.

46.___Uninterested in activities going on.

47.___Disrupts activities going on.

48.___Swears.

49.___Appears generally happy.

51.___Possessive of you.

52.___Teases or provokes other children.

53.___Isolated, few or no friends.

54.___Shows leadership.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
School of Social Work

DAYCARE CONSULTATION PROGRAM

There are no "right" answers to these questions. We are trying to find some of the many ways that mothers handle these problems. Just write (or say) what you think you would do on a regular day.

1. You have just started talking on the phone and two of the children you are caring for start calling to you to come to them, and they keep trying to get your attention. What would you do?

   If that doesn't work, what would you do next?

2. You just put out snacks, and one of the children spills his cup of juice on purpose. What would you do?

   Why would you do that?

3. You are baking a cake and the children keep bothering you. What would you do?

What would you do if you were in a hurry to go shopping?

4. One of the children hits another child, who then started to cry. What would you do?

What would you do if you were tired and had a headache?

5. One mother is often late in picking up her child. What would you do?

If that doesn't work, what next?

EDUCATIONAL DAY CARE CONSULTATION PROGRAM
EVALUATION

1. Did you find the visits to your home helpful?
(Circle the number that is closest to how you feel)

Not at all Helpful				Very Helpful
1	2	3	4	5

2. What did you espceially like about the visits?

3. What didn't you like about the visits?

4. Did you feel the group meetings were helpful?
(Circle the number that is closest to how you feel.)

Not at all Helpful				Very Helpful
1	2	3	4	5

5. What did you especially like about the meetings?

6. What didn't you like about the meetings?

7. In a future program, would you like the visits to be

a) the same b) different How?

8. In a future program, would you like the group meetings to be

   a) the same b) different How?

9. Would you be interested in a program like this next year?

   a) yes b) no Why?

10. Additional Comments: